



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/533,702	05/03/2005	Harold A Goldsberry III	CH-756/MD02-94	7830

7590 08/26/2008
Lanxess Corporation
Law & Intellectual Property Department
111 Ride Park West Drive
Pittsburgh, PA 15275-1112

EXAMINER

CORDRAY, DENNIS R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1791

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/26/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/533,702

Applicant(s)

GOLDSBERRY ET AL.

Examiner

DENNIS CORDRAY

Art Unit

1791

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 May 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 16, 30, 33 and 34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 16, 30, 33 and 34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's amendments and arguments have overcome the outstanding rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 and the outstanding rejections over the cited prior art. Therefore, the rejections have been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, new grounds of rejection are made as detailed below.

Applicant's comments regarding the Provisional Double Patenting rejections are noted. The Provisional Double Patenting rejections will be maintained until one of the applications is allowable or until they are no longer applicable.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 and 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

2. Claims 1-5, 16, 30 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Frolich et al (6093217).

Claims 1-3, 5, 30 and 33: Frolich et al discloses an aqueous sizing dispersion comprising alkyl or alkenyl ketene dimer (AKD) and/or alkenyl succinic anhydride (ASA), a dispersing agent (emulsifying agent), a surfactant and a retention aid, (Abs; col 1, lines 5-9; col 2, lines 48-57; col 3, lines 1-20 and 28-30; col 4, lines 34-36; col 6, lines 48-52). In some embodiments, the dispersing agent is an anionic starch (first starch component) and is present in an amount of up to 100% by weight based on the sizing

agent (col 3, lines 44-49 and 61-67; col 4, lines 1-2 and 29-31). The surfactant is present in an amount from 0.1% to 20% based on the sizing agent (col 5, lines 26-29). In an example, the retention agent comprises a cationic starch (second starch component) in an amount of 8 kg/ton based on the dry stock and the dosage of sizing agent is from 0.4 to 0.8 kg/ton based on the dry stock (col 10, lines 4-27, Example 2), resulting in a ratio of cationic starch to sizing agent of 10:1 to 20:1, thus the ratio of the total weight of starch. The disclosed compositions significantly overlay compositions as claimed. The dispersed sizing agent is suspended in an aqueous dispersion comprising the dispersing agent, thus is suspended in the first starch component. The disclosed composition is a sizing composition, thus imparts useful sizing properties to paper (col 9, lines 16-21 and Example 2).

Claim 4: Frolich et al discloses a droplet size (or particle size, since the sizing agent can be solid, see col 8, lines 17-19) of the sizing agent from 0.1 to 3 μm (col 8, lines 1-3).

Claim 16: Frolich et al discloses a method of making the composition comprising mixing an aqueous phase with the dispersing agent, the sizing agent and the surfactant and homogenizing the mixture to create an emulsion. The size dispersion can be premixed with the retention aid to make the sizing composition (col 6, lines 48-52; col 7, line 61 to col 8, line 7).

3. Claims 6-11 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frolich et al as evidenced by Chunyu "Alkenyl Succinic Anhydrides (ASA): a Neutral sizing agent", China Pulp & Paper, No. 3, 2002, provided by applicant).

Claim 6: Frolich et al does not disclose hydrolyzed ASA. It is well known that ASA is very reactive and will readily hydrolyze in the presence of water (if evidence is needed, see Chunyu, p 3, Figure 4 and paragraph immediately below the figure). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to obtain an amount of hydrolyzed ASA within the claimed range due to the large amount of water present in the sizing compositions.

Claims 7-9: Frolich et al does not disclose the claimed properties of the composition. The composition of Frolich et al is substantially identical to the claimed composition and will have the claimed sizing and stability properties because, where the claimed and prior art apparatus or product are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition, a *prima facie* case of either anticipation or obviousness has been established. *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 1255, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977). In other words, when the structure recited in the reference is substantially identical to that of the claims, the claimed properties or functions are presumed to be inherent.

Claims 10 and 11: Frolich et al does not disclose the particle size distribution in the sizing compositions. However, compositions having particle sizes from 0.1 to 3 μm are disclosed as providing beneficial sizing. Absent convincing evidence of unexpected results due to a particular particle distribution, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use any particle distribution, monomodal or multimodal for the

sizing composition of Frolich et al as functionally equivalent options with a reasonable expectation of success in obtaining useful sizing properties.

Claim 34: Frolich et al does not disclose two anionic starch components. Frolich et al does disclose anionic starches that can be phosphonated, sulfonated or carboxylated as dispersing agents. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to also use a mixture of anionic starches as dispersing agents and to have a reasonable expectation of success in creating the emulsion and obtaining useful sizing properties. "It is prima facie obvious to combine two compositions each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose, in order to form a third composition to be used for the very same purpose... [T]he idea of combining them flows logically from their having been individually taught in the prior art." In re Kerkhoven, 626 F.2d 846, 850, 205 USPQ 1069, 1072 (CCPA 1980).

4. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Frolich et al.

Claim 30 is a product-by-process claim. The product of Frolich et al appears to be the same as or similar to the claimed product, an aqueous emulsion of ASA and starch, although produced by a different process. The burden therefore shifts to applicant to come forward with evidence establishing an unobvious difference between the claimed product and the prior art product. In re Marosi, 710 F.2d 798, 802, 218 USPQ 289, 292 (Fed. Cir.1983). "In the event any differences can be shown for the product of the product-by-process claim 30 as opposed to the product taught by the

reference Frolich et al, such differences would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art as a routine modification of the product in the absence of a showing of unexpected results: see also *In re Thorpe*, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985)”

5. Claims 1-5, 16, 30, 33 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Conner et al (6183550).

Claims 1-3, 5, 30, 33 and 34: Conner et al discloses an aqueous sizing dispersion comprising alkyl or alkenyl ketene dimer (AKD) and/or alkenyl succinic anhydride (ASA), a surfactant dispersant (emulsifying agent), a and a starch stabilizer (first starch component) that in some embodiments can be nonionic or anionic, e.g. oxidized or ethylated starch, pearl starch (Abs; col 2, line 39 to col 3, line 1; col 4, line 61 to col 5, line 23; col 6, lines 13-16 and 57-67; col 9, lines 25-29). The sizing agent is present in an amount from about 1 to about 50% on a dry basis based on the total weight of the dispersion (col 9, lines 11-14). The surfactant is present in an amount from 0.0001% to 20% based on the total weight of the dispersion (col 9, lines 14-21). The starch is present in an amount up to about 20% on a dry basis based on the total weight of the dispersion (col 9, lines 35-38). In some embodiments, a cationic starch (second starch component) may be added to increase the cationic charge level of the dispersion. In other embodiments, an anionic starch (second starch component) may be added to increase the anionic charge level of the dispersion (col 9, line 64 to col 10,

line 9). The disclosed compositions significantly overlay compositions as claimed. The dispersed sizing agent is suspended in an aqueous dispersion comprising the first starch component, thus is suspended in the first starch component.

While Conner et al does not disclose the first starch component as an emulsifying starch, the disclosed starches overlay those claimed, thus will act as emulsifiers as well as stabilizers because, where the claimed and prior art apparatus or product are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition, a *prima facie* case of either anticipation or obviousness has been established. *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 1255, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977). In other words, when the structure recited in the reference is substantially identical to that of the claims, the claimed properties or functions are presumed to be inherent.

The disclosed composition is a sizing composition, thus imparts useful sizing properties to paper or, at least, obtaining useful sizing properties would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art (also see col 10, lines 31-41).

Claim 4: In an example, the median particle size is 0.63 microns, which changed to 0.88 microns after 14 days (col 15, lines 58-63, Example 12).

Claim 16: Conner et al discloses a method of making the sizing compositions comprising emulsifying the sizing agent, surfactant and first starch component in water (col 9, lines 5-29; col 11, lines 17-43, Example 1; col 12, lines 13-20, Example 3). Conner et al does not disclose forming an emulsion comprising the first starch component and combining the emulsion with the second starch component. However, absent convincing evidence of unexpected properties due to the two-step starch

addition, it would have been obvious to combine the second charge adjusting starch after the formation of the emulsion and have a reasonable expectation of success in forming the emulsion and obtaining useful sizing properties.

Claim 30 is a product-by-process claim. The product of Conner et al appears to be the same as or similar to the claimed product, an aqueous emulsion of ASA and starch, although produced by a different process. The burden therefore shifts to applicant to come forward with evidence establishing an unobvious difference between the claimed product and the prior art product. In re Marosi, 710 F.2d 798, 802, 218 USPQ 289, 292 (Fed. Cir.1983). "In the event any differences can be shown for the product of the product-by-process claim 30 as opposed to the product taught by the reference Conner et al, such differences would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art as a routine modification of the product in the absence of a showing of unexpected results: see also In re Thorpe, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985)"

6. Claims 6-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Conner et al as evidenced by Chunyu "Alkenyl Succinic Anhydrides (ASA): a Neutral sizing agent", China Pulp & Paper, No. 3, 2002-- provided by applicant).

Claim 6: Conner et al does not disclose hydrolyzed ASA. It is well known that ASA is very reactive and will readily hydrolyze in the presence of water (see Chunyu, p 3, Figure 4 and paragraph immediately below the figure). It would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art to obtain an amount of hydrolyzed ASA within the claimed range due to the large amount of water present in the sizing compositions.

Claims 7-9: Conner et al does not disclose the claimed properties of the composition. The composition of Frolich et al is substantially identical to the claimed composition and will have the claimed sizing and stability properties because, where the claimed and prior art apparatus or product are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition, a *prima facie* case of either anticipation or obviousness has been established. *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 1255, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977). In other words, when the structure recited in the reference is substantially identical to that of the claims, the claimed properties or functions are presumed to be inherent.

Claims 10 and 11: Conner et al does not disclose the particle size distribution in the sizing compositions. Absent convincing evidence of unexpected results due to a particular particle distribution, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use any particle distribution, monomodal or multimodal for the sizing composition of Frolich et al as functionally equivalent options with a reasonable expectation of success in obtaining useful sizing properties.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir.

1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

7. Claims 1, 4-11 and 33 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3-10 and 45 of copending Application No. 10/534202. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the copending application are generic to the instant Claims. The copending application recites aqueous sizing compositions comprising emulsions having the same cellulose reactive sizes, a surfactant and a starch component. The open claim language of the copending application permits a species of the invention comprising a second starch, thus are generic to the instant claims. The sizing compositions have the same particle sizes and the same sizing effects on fibrous substrates.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

8. Claims 1, 3-11 and 33 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3-4, 6-13 and 47 of copending Application No. 10/533190. Although the conflicting claims are not

identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the copending application are a species of the instant Claims. The copending application recites aqueous sizing compositions comprising emulsions having the same cellulose reactive sizes, a polymer solution and a second component that can be a starch. The instant claims embody a species of the copending claims comprising starch only. The sizing compositions have the same particle sizes, overlapping starch:reactive size ratios, a surfactant and the same sizing effects on fibrous substrates. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a mixture of starches (thus having a first starch component and a second starch component) in the claimed composition of Application No. 10/533190.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DENNIS CORDRAY whose telephone number is (571)272-8244. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F, 7:30 -4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven Griffin can be reached on 571-272-1189. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Steven P. Griffin/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 1791

/Dennis Cordray/
Examiner, Art Unit 1791